

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,634	04/02/2004	Kia Silverbrook	HYG002US	9823	
24011 SILVERBROO	7590 07/07/200 OK RESEARCH PTY I	EXAM	EXAMINER		
393 DARLING	G STREET	HESS, DANIEL A			
BALMAIN, 20 AUSTRALIA	041	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
1100111111111			2876		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/07/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

I	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
l	10/815,634	SILVERBROOK ET AL.	
ĺ	Examiner	Art Unit	
ı	DANIEL A. HESS	2876	

	DANIEL A. HESS	2876							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address									
THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
. Material The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time									
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEIN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.138(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
NOTICE OF APPEAL	lianna with 27 CER 41 27 must be 4	Slad within two manths	of the date of						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>									
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 									
									(d) They present additional claims without canceling a
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	A Government of North Control		TOL 004)						
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	OL-324).						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the						
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		be entered and an e	planation of						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 9-13, 16-20 and 38-42. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
Management of the request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.									
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:									
	/Daniel A Hess/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2876							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The following discussion pertains particularly to independent claim 1.

The examiner makes a couple of points which the applicant will hopefully find helpful. Firstly, while the prior art admittedly does not show a plurality of codes on a product, it is known in the art to have multiple codes at different locations on a product to increase the chances that one of them can be picked up from a given scanning angle. This is true both for mailed parcels and for retail packages.

Secondly, the discussion of tiling of codes is only in the preamble, and none of the steps of the method claim seem to require this tiling of a plurality of codes, except perhaps to making the 'sensing' step easier (which would have been obvious, as discussed above). The detection of 'indicating data' relating to 'product item identity' and 'product status' are overly broad and as such can be easily met by the prior art.